

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-27 are all the claims pending in the present application. In summary, the Examiner maintains the previous prior art rejections and adds a few new arguments in the *Response to Arguments* section of the Office Action. Specifically, claims 1-27 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Sideman (U.S. Patent Appln. Pub. No. 2002/0116716). We propose to traverse the rejections at least based on the reasons set forth below.

A brief description of Sideman is set forth in the Amendment dated March 11, 2008.

With respect to independent claim 1, Applicant previously argued that Sideman does not disclose or suggest at least a client that can “create a multimedia editing command file using a multimedia editing program,” as recited in claim 1. *See pages 8-9 of March 11 Amendment.* The Examiner previously cited numbered paragraph 20 of Sideman as allegedly satisfying the above-quoted feature of claim 1. However, in the present Office Action, the Examiner now relies on numbered paragraphs 24-25 and 76-80 to allegedly satisfy the above-quoted feature of claim 1. Specifically, the Examiner alleges:

Regarding claim 1, Applicant argues that Sideman does not disclose or suggest at least a client that can “create multimedia editing command file using a multimedia editing program”. The examiner disagrees with the applicant’s above argument because Sideman clearly states that the client may create the edit list (See [0024]-[0025]) and [0076]-[0080] which discloses that the client uses the interface and produces and creates the edit list. Furthermore, [0024]-[0025] clearly indicates that the content is edited with the edit list when requested. Hence, the client not only is allowed to control the edit list as argued by applicant but creates and produces the edit list as well.

In response, Applicant submits that the cited portions of Sideman only teach that an interface is downloaded from a server to a client for editing content at the server. According to claim 1, the creation of a multimedia editing command file using a multimedia editing program occurs at a client. Clearly, Sideman does not disclose or suggest that the creation of the multimedia editing command file occurs at a client, as the client thereof only downloads an interface for communicating with a program on a server.

Therefore, at least based on the foregoing, Applicant submits that Sideman does not anticipate claim 1.

Applicant submits that dependent claims 2-4 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependencies from independent claim 1.

Further, with respect to dependent claim 2, Applicant previously argued that Sideman does not disclose or suggest at least, “wherein the client is operable to download the multimedia editing program from the server,” as recited in claim 2. *See page 9 of March 11 Amendment*. The Examiner previously relied on the Abstract of Sideman to allegedly satisfy the above-quoted feature of claim 2, however the Examiner now relies on numbered paragraphs 73 and 84 of Sideman. Specifically, the Examiner alleges:

Regarding claim 2. Applicant argues that Sideman does not disclose or suggest at least “wherein the client is operable to download the multimedia editing program from the server”. The examiner disagrees with the applicant’s above argument because Sideman clearly discloses a virtual video editor control panel displayed on his or her computer screen as well as a flash module downloaded by every client for formatting images (See [0073] and [0084]). Hence, the virtual editor control panel in conjunction with the flash module serves as the multimedia editing program as they

are each downloaded by the client as well as being necessary for any editing to occur and function.

As indicated in the previous Amendment, according to Applicant's understanding of Sideman, this reference only discloses that a client is allowed to control a video editor program running on a server. In fact, numbered paragraph 73 expressly indicates that software applications comprising an editor are "deployed in a Web server". There is no teaching of such applications being downloaded to a client. A client in Sideman may receive an interface to communicate with an editing program that resides on a server, but the client in Sideman does not download a multimedia editing program from the server. At least based on the foregoing, Applicant submits that Sideman does not anticipate claim 2.

Applicant submits that independent claims 5, 12, 13, 19, and 24 are patentable at least based on reasons similar to those set forth above with respect to claim 1.

Applicant submits that dependent claims 2-4, 6-11, 14-18, 20-23, and 25-27 are patentable at least by virtue of their respective dependencies from independent claims 1, 5, 13, 19, and 24.

Further, Applicant submits that dependent claims 9 and 14 are patentable at least based on reasons similar to those set forth above with respect to claim 2.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.


Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

  
Diallo T. Crenshaw  
Registration No. 52,778

Date: June 27, 2008